

## **APPENDIX E**

**Table 1****Public Participation:****Key Issues for Advisory Committee(s)****1. Should the state do more to provide adequate opportunity for stakeholder groups to participate in development of the program? If so, how?**

The state published a notice in Volume 15 Issue 4 of the Virginia Register seeking participation on the technical and citizens committee to develop the SWAP. Many state and federal agencies were directly solicited for participation as well as individuals that had expressed interest at the EPA SWAP workshop held in Raleigh, NC on May 29-30, 1997 and at a Chesapeake/Virginia joint AWWA workshop in Falls Church, VA on August 7, 1997. Special efforts were expended to include citizen, environment group, and sensitive population representatives on the TAC.

The TAC recommends that the state mail the attached summary to the citizen, environmental and technical groups listed to obtain their input on the draft SWAP. In addition, publish the summary in the Virginia Register and place it on the VDH website.

**2. Should the state do more to receive recommendations from both technical and citizen's perspectives?**

The state will hold public meetings after the TAC and the TEAM have concurred with the SWAP to receive additional public input. The state will seek opportunities to make SWAP presentations at technical, professional, environmental, etc. meetings and workshops.

The TAC recommends that the state mail the attached summary to the citizen, environmental and technical groups listed to obtain their input on the draft SWAP. In addition, publish the summary in the Virginia Register and place it on the VDH website.

**3. What should the state do for ongoing public participation in implementing assessments once the state's SWAP is approved?**

The state does not plan to directly involve the public in implementing assessments. Public involvement is considered vital during the source water protection efforts.

However, the TAC recommends that the state utilize (prior to the inventory task) local meetings to educate the consumers and to obtain information on Land Use/Activities in the assessment areas.

## Table 2

### State's Strategic Approach:

#### Key Issues for Advisory Committee(s)

1. **Has the state done an initial review of all data sources available and determine the scope of the need for additional information?**

Yes

The state has initiated researching the availability of data from other state, federal and local sources. The state intends to utilize appropriate data and to translate the data into GIS format with contracted services.

The TAC includes representatives from numerous agencies.

2. **What level of exactness/detail should be achieved by each assessment to be considered "complete?"**

The initial assessment for the purposes of the SWAP would be complete if the delineation, inventory and susceptibility determinations have been performed following the SWAP criteria.

3. **Should the level of assessment provide for the protection and/or benefit of the public water supply(s)?**

Yes

4. **What should be the basis for differential levels of assessments to be completed for different public water supplies or categories of public water supplies? System type or size? Preliminary information about the existence of threats? Other?**

The SWAP describes differential assessments for surface versus groundwater and Community and Nontransient-Noncommunity versus Transient-Noncommunity (TNC) sources. The TNC sources assessment will be limited to the regulated contaminants, microbes and nitrate. The surface versus ground water susceptibility determinations have inherent differences.

5. **How will the state SWAP be coordinated among various environmental and other state programs (e.g. PWSS, water quality, water resources, agriculture, land use, information management, geologic)?**

Many of the environmental and other related state programs have representatives on the TAC. All GIS layers developed from this effort will be available to all state, federal and

**Table 2 (cont'd)**

local agencies through a state clearinghouse i.e. the Virginia Economic Development Partnership or the Virginia Geographic Information Network. Reference is made to the SWAP section on state groundwater and surface water programs.

**6. How would the state's assessment program lead to state watershed approaches and link to wellhead and other protection programs?**

The state's assessment program should foster and support watershed approaches and source water protection programs by providing additional watershed information such as accurate locations of water sources and an inventory of land use activities and by making it available to other agencies. The Department of Environmental Quality and the Ground Water Protection Steering Committee agencies are involved in the development of the SWAP.

### Table 3

#### **Delineation, Source Inventory, and Susceptibility:**

##### **Key Questions for the Advisory Committee(s)**

- 1. What delineation method and criteria will be used for systems using ground waters? Where shall recharge areas not be included and why?**

The state's Source Water Assessment Technical and Citizens Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Source Water Assessment TEAM developed the delineation criteria as presented in the SWAP.

The TAC felt that specific recharge areas are not included by definition and it is not practical to do so.

- 2. What contaminants that are not currently regulated by EPA should be part of the state's SWAP program?**

While the basic contaminants of concern are those regulated by EPA, the assessment inherently is more extensive in that land use activities are inventoried and included in the susceptibility determination rather than specific contaminants.

- 3. Should the state segment source water protection areas for more focused source inventories? What should be the basis for such segmentation?**

Yes, the state should and the TAC and the TEAM established the segmentation presented in the SWAP.

- 4. How should the state define and identify significant potential contamination sources and how should the state undertake their inventory within source water protection areas?**

The TAC and the TEAM developed these guidelines as presented in the SWAP.

- 5. How will the results of the susceptibility analysis be characterized?**

The TAC and the TEAM developed this characterization as presented in the SWAP.

**Table 4**

**Boundary Waters, Multi-State Rivers, and the Great**

**Lakes: Key Issues for Advisory Committee(s)**

- 1. What agreement should the state maintain or initiate with other states, tribes, or nations to gain more complete and consistent source water assessments?**

The State is currently supporting the Interstate Commission of the Potomac's efforts to coordinate activities involving source water assessments for Potomac intakes. The State should strive to develop appropriate agreements and to share information with other states and tribal organizations.

- 2. What contingency plans should be pursued?**

Contingency plans do not appear necessary.

- 3. What coordination/facilitation activities should the state request of EPA?**

EPA should facilitate States meeting together to discuss interstate issues.

- 4. Are compatible and complimentary assessments being done in watersheds shared with other states and countries?**

Efforts are being taken to meet with applicable states to effectively coordinate assessment activities to ensure appropriate assessments of all sources.

**Table 5**

**Making the Results of Assessments**

**Available to the Public:**

**Key Issues for Advisory Committee(s)**

- 1. What should be included in the results of the assessments, what should be the format of an understandable report on results, and when should the results be made available?**

The assessment report should include the following:

- A brief narrative explaining the assessment procedure and results
- A map of the delineated source water assessment area (SWAA) including source location(s)
- The location and description of inventoried land use activities within the SWAA
- The name and address of identified owners of such activities
- A priority ranking of the land use activities identified
- Known contamination of the source within the last 5 years for contaminants listed in Section VI-C.

The report format should be as simple as practical yet clearly identify the above items and should be made available to the public immediately following completion.

- 2. How and when should the state make available all the information collected during each assessment when someone requests it?**

The State should make every effort to provide such information upon request. Copies of the information should be provided for a reasonable handling fee. Interested individuals who prefer to review the information without requiring copies should be allowed to do so. Copies will be made available at the waterworks, the local health department and a local library by the State.

- 3. What type of maps should be developed to display the results of the assessments?**

The State is making efforts to obtain the capabilities to provide a hard copy of a GIS generated map showing the delineated SWAA and inventoried land use activities. As a minimum the above information should be provided on a section of a USGS quad sheet.

**(Table 5 cont'd)**

**4. How and when should the state make public all information collected during each assessment for a PWS(s)?**

The State should not make public all information collected during each assessment. The State should make public that an assessment(s) has been completed for a PWS and how all information can be requested or viewed.

Provide notification of the availability of the results and other information collected to the local health departments, extension agents and town/county/city administrators and request them to include the notice in newsletters and other communications with the public.

Reference is made to the SWAP Section VIII Making Assessments Available to the Public for details.

**5. How should the state or delegated entities provide wide notification of the availability of the results and other information collected?**

Provide wide notification of the availability of the results and other information collected by use of the Internet with links to the USEPA "Surf Your Watershed" effort, the Virginia Register, the Virginia Press Association members, press releases and public service announcements on a monthly basis.

Reference is made to the SWAP Section VIII Making Assessments Available to the Public for details.



**Table 6**

**State Program Implementation:**

**Key Issues for Advisory Committee(s)**

**1. What should be the timetable for state SWAP program implementation?**

The timetable for completing community and nontransient noncommunity waterworks assessments is July 1, 2002 and December 31, 2002 for transient noncommunity.

**2. How much should the state spend on SWAP program development and implementation, and should the resources come from the DWSRF and/or other resources?**

The State should utilize the maximum amount available through the DWSRF set-asides. Since the Final Guidance states "EPA believes that Congress expected the assessment set-aside funds would be sufficient for assessment functions" and since the State set-aside the maximum allowed, no further funding should be utilized. The State will be supporting this effort with existing PWSS staff.

**3. Should the state delegate aspects of the assessments? If so, to whom? Should funding be provided to delegated entities?**

Virginia's plan does not delegate aspects of the assessment to other entities.

The State should encourage the waterworks, planning district commissions, etc. to participate in whole or in part in the assessment process. However, any assessment must meet or exceed the requirements in the SWAP and receive approval/concurrence by the State. Funding should be made available for the large (>50,000 population) and/or complex surface source assessments. Delegation to other agencies is not necessary or practical.

**4. How should state agencies coordinate with each other and with other state, federal, and local stakeholders when implementing SWAPs?**

The State should make all assessment information available to other state, federal and local stakeholders. See Table 2 Key Issue #5.

**5. How and what should the state report to EPA regarding SWAP implementation?**

The State should report to EPA on an annual basis the number of initial assessments completed during the previous year. Reports would end once these assessments for all waterworks are complete.

**Table 6 (cont'd)****6. When and how should the state update assessments?**

The next general update of the assessments should take place during assessments required by the Ground Water Rule. Waterworks that develop Source Water Protection Plans should include an element requiring updates based on new land use activities of concern within the SWAA. The State's sanitary survey forms should include a question to the owner relative to any knowledge of new land use activities of concern. The sanitary survey staff should be provided (on a routine basis) updated GIS layers which should identify new land use activities for their consideration.